Communities of Opportunity
Interim Governance Group
Meeting Notes

April 15, 2016

Location: Seattle Foundation Community Room, 1200 5th Ave, Seattle

Members Present: Adam Taylor, David Fleming (via phone), Deanna Dawson, Gordon McHenry, Jeff Natter, John Page, Michael Brown, Michael Woo, Scarlett Aldebot-Green, Sili Savusa, Tony To (via phone), Ubax Gardheere

Staff Present: AJ McClure (via phone), Alice Ito, Bao-Tram Do, Kirsten Wysen, Holly Rohr Tran

Guests Present: Marguerite Ro, Public Health-Seattle & King County

Welcome and Introductions   2:00 p.m.

Michael Brown welcomed the Communities of Opportunity (COO) Interim Governance Group (IGG) and led the group in a round of introductions.

COO Communications Work   2:05 p.m.

Alice Ito and Kirsten Wysen noted that COO communications planning and materials are being developed with support from Sharon Bogan (Public Health-Seattle & King County) and Seattle Foundation communications staff. The COO Communication Planning document was reviewed, including Goals, Objectives, Strategies, Tactics and Timeline.

It was noted that in the near future, IGG members may be called on to communicate on behalf of COO leading up to the Metropolitan King County Council's passage of the Communities of Opportunity implementation plan as part of the Best Starts for Kids implementation plan submitted on June 1, and that members should be comfortable and equipped to do so. In addition, materials will also be useful in equipping IGG members as ambassadors for COO within and across sectors and setting the stage for a successful Learning Community.

IGG members noted that the following materials and support would be useful to them:

- Highlight local health, social and economic inequities
  - Michael Brown noted Seattle Times article *In King County, your address may tell you how long you'll live*, originally published Apr. 15, 2016 – the article mentions COO
- Standard answer for oft-received question: "What is COO going to do with $6M?"
- Know where to go to get current key messages, where to get responses to queries
- Receive regular email digest of relevant news clips, articles, etc.

- Forward relevant social media posts for reposting on partner sites/accounts
  - Need COO hashtag
- Talking points around "how does COO, which is making some geographically targeted investments in a small area of King County, help community taxpayers as a whole throughout the county?
- Jargon-free community-friendly fact sheet (for residents, etc.)
- Specific success stories/what's working from COO work to-date
- Answer for "How can I get involved?"
- One website (currently different COO content on Seattle Foundation and King County websites)

Draft COO Implementation Frame   2:20 p.m.

Michael Brown noted that in preparation for the May 12-13 IGG retreat, the group should begin considering an implementation frame that will encompass its overall work (this group already discussed the BSK-specific COO implementation plan – this is broader). The IGG is responsible for COO as a whole, and there are investments from multiple funders (Seattle Foundation, Satterberg Foundation, Living Cities, PHPDA, access to capital through CDFI's, etc.), with potential for more.

IGG should think strategically and proactively about the whole – how to guide investments to get the outcomes we're after.

- This is a big issue; in addition to talking about this at the retreat, a subgroup can draft an implementation frame and bring back to larger group.
  - Volunteers: Jeff, David, Deanna, Scarlett, Tony (optional, due to availability restrictions)

Learning Community (LC) concept. Last meeting, the group discussed reworking the concept; Marguerite Ro shared learnings from Partnerships to Improve Community Health (PICH) at that meeting which demonstrated how COO can become more relevant to King County as a whole.

- Re: proposal for opening up the Learning Community only to areas that are lowest 30% in health, housing and economic opportunity measures:
  - Do we want to put this restriction on? Having open-ended invite sends a good message that everyone is welcome.
  - Depends on purpose of the LC; use the vision to achieve strategy.
    - Difference between annual "wide-open" conference and building relationships (group of leaders across grantees pulling together for a common journey).
    - Consider whether the purpose is to help places that aren't doing so well or to lift up best practices in the County.
  - Concern that opening up LC to larger community runs risk of spending energy, time and limited staff resources getting folks up to speed on COO – better to invest in relationships.
  - Consider a 2-tiered approach?

- o Adam noted (on behalf of the SeaTac/Tukwila site) that one of the benefits of the work so far is seeing what's happening elsewhere and having a way to connect in; this will multiply if other communities are brought in (Auburn, Skyway, etc.). Challenge is how to make LC accessible, not a burden.
- Approach "Learning Community" from relational perspective and two-way learning, we don't have all the answers. Believe in ability to share the work reflect this in how we talk about/approach the LC. The term "learning cohort" was proposed as one alternative to "learning community"
- COO's goals, viewed through a lens of race, highlight some geographic areas of the county and doesn't include others to the same degree. Would be good to find a way to lift up what we're all learning together, and how it influences what happens in the neighborhood. For example, would be great to bring in Renton Sunset-area work.
- "Tool kit" to help transfer learnings to other communities - lift up lessons learned, expertise gained in first year of COO.
- Need a mechanism to share challenges, successes, failures, set-backs from those we've funded, so that others can benefit from what grantees are learning with their funding; COO has created its own "haves" and "have nots." Acknowledge that it's hard to find the time to talk with each other and share with other leaders. Funding and food can help achieve that.
- Basis for entry into LC; collective impact. Bring in those committed to change in the whole community, not just forwarding their organization. Don't want to spend time describing business models and providing report outs: focus instead on turning the curve on data – this is a different approach that requires collective impact.
- Be aware that organizations already receiving COO funding may have resources to participate; others coming in may not.
- Consider annual or bi-annual summit to bring in others.
- Learning cohort could act as a bridge between policy & systems and place-based grantees.
- Use strategic communications about COO learnings to build leadership capacity at ground level; will function as sustainability plan.
- We've been talking about building the backbone of a collective impact effort. Our area is program rich/system poor; there is no shortage of good ideas, but the challenge has been knitting them together to get to scale.

Michael Brown noted that this group's infrastructure (strategic communications, implementation frame, Learning Community) needs some thoughtful attention (as has been done with COO sites). This forms basis of the IGG retreat next month.

Discuss IGG May 12-13 Retreat   3:00 p.m.

Alice Ito distributed a list of potential key goals for retreat and asked IGG members' input on desired outcomes. Discussion included:

- Inspiration; to be emotionally uplifted around problems COO is addressing and gain hope/confidence about change we're creating
- Learn more about BSK and its inter-relationship to COO. Ensure work is complementing, supporting and sustaining
- Follow-up on adaptive leadership work this group started, but didn't finish last year. Use that work to inform clear objectives, strategies, and identification of additional pieces of work.
- Consider how to structure financing streams to maximize Collective Impact. Are there ways to better link and improve synergy between policy & systems and place-based work?
- Develop 1-pager that uses theory of change to lay out what we plan to achieve in the next few years
- Need to articulate cumulative impact we want to see in our sites and programs and how it connects to BSK (example given for sake of illustration: "get unemployment rate in south Seattle/south King County down to 7%"), then mobilize resources and attention around this
  - 3-5-10 year milestones.
  - The chart on the policy and systems Recommendations document was helpful – proposals laid out by Results Area and Geography showed how each of the proposals could contribute to the larger goal.
- Identify tactics/how we're going to achieve cumulative impact in addition to strategies.
- Do we have the right folks at the table to answer questions we have?
  - Need to know what markers and sub-markers are before we can come up with membership.
  - Important to bring in other innovators (can bring value to the conversation at retreat) - opportunity for you to reach out to communities.
- Relationship mapping to identify leverage points for what we're trying to achieve. Things happening at a meta-level that are not necessarily being utilized toward the best end by this group
- Need dashboard to monitor success/meeting goals to funders.

Finalize Systems & Policy Change Portfolio of Grants   3:20 p.m.

Using the document "Communities of Opportunity; Systems and Policy Change Grants – Round 2," Alice Ito reviewed the summary of approved grants, IGG discussion and decisions from last meeting, and considerations regarding remaining proposals.

The decision before the IGG at today's meeting is how to prioritize remaining proposals? Staff prepared 3 dockets for IGG consideration; IGG may choose not to offer any further grants or recommend any other combination of funding.

Discussion included:

- Funding recommendations for remaining proposals total $225K, based on staff comfort level with current/known budget. Limitations exist for using public funds to supplement this.
- The split between "Significant Policy Reach" and "Strong Connection to Community" proposals is unfortunate. For future rounds of funding, consider whether a process redesign might avoid this or help us receive proposals that are strong in both areas.
- Use this funding opportunity to strengthen and build leadership in small grassroots groups so that they are better equipped to access future funding (one of the things we said early-on in COO that we wanted to do). Size of these grants are smaller than Tier 1, but can help these groups do what's necessary to lead to grassroots policy change.
- Current funding process is for staff to do homework on the proposals and make recommendations: IGG's role is to approve grants, based on staff recommendations .
  - An IGG member expressed discomfort about making funding decisions for proposals they hadn't read.
  - Other IGG members expressed great confidence in the ability and grant-making experience of the staff team and indicated they were comfortable making decisions based on staff recommendations.
  - Question raised about whether current process needs to be amended.
- Proposal review criteria were not changed/remained the same throughout the process – staff applied them as evenly as possible. All docket options before the IGG today fit within these criteria –decision before the IGG today is a question of IGG priorities and emphases.
- Recommendation to add one more option: "Fund all 7" (start with "Balanced" docket amounts, add three more). This would require an additional $135K of investments (on top of $225K).
  - Question was raised about further reducing amounts to stay within $225K – staff noted that most recommended amounts are reduced already; any further reductions may render proposals non-viable.
  - Some cautious optimism expressed about being able to assign additional $135K for this purpose: Founders and staff will delve into budgets and revisit financing limits.
  - Could explore releasing funds in stages, based on grantee needs, to align with anticipated revenue flow.

IGG voted for funding additional Policy and Systems Change grants within the following 4 options:

1. **Significant Policy Reach** docket option, as recommended by staff
2. **Strong Connection to Community** docket option, as recommended by staff
   - 2 IGG member votes in favor
3. **Balanced** docket option, as recommended by staff
   - 2 IGG member votes in favor
   - 3 more IGG members absent at today's meeting voted in favor of this option via email prior to this meeting; however, option 4 was not part of the consideration at that time
4. **Fund All 7** proposals appearing on docket as suggested at this meeting and noted in detail above

- 7 IGG member votes in favor
- IGG members were to speak up if they could not live with the decision to fund all 7 proposals; no objections were raised.

*One IGG member in attendance at the meeting was out of the room at the time the vote was taken – that member's input is not reflected here.

Updates & Announcements   3:55 p.m.

- Seattle Foundation received a HUD Secretary Award for Public-Philanthropic Partnerships at the Council of Foundations conference in Washington, D.C. for COO work.
- COO was highlighted in a Pew webinar on neighborhood health and well-being, by contributing presenter Carrie Cihak (King County).
- COO was highlighted in a Living Cities webinar on cross-sector collaborations, by contributing presenters Kirsten Wysen and Cheryl Markham.
- Living Cities' March 2016 Learning Community take-aways:
  - Workforce and comprehensive development; how to leverage capital; new connections for potential funding opportunity for place-based site.
  - Looking forward to more 1:1 relationship-building with other Living Cities sites – opportunities for site visits between Seattle/San Francisco/New Orleans.
- May 12-13 IGG retreat: IGG members are encouraged to stay overnight, if possible.

Meeting Adjourned   4:05 p.m.

Next meetings, upcoming events and deadlines:
- May 12-13, 2016; 2-day retreat
- June 1, 2016 implementation due date for King County Council
- June 17, 2016; 2-4 p.m.
- July 15, 2016; 2-4 p.m.
- Aug. 19, 2016; 2-4 p.m.
- Sept 16, 2016; 2-4 p.m.
- Oct. 21, 2016; 2-4 p.m.
- Nov. 18, 2016; 2-4 p.m.
- Dec. 16, 2016; 2-4 p.m.

Interim Governance Group Members:
1. Adam Taylor, Global to Local
2. Adrienne Quinn, King County Department of Community and Human Services
3. Betsy Jones, King County Executive's Office
4. David Fleming, PATH
5. Deanna Dawson, Sound Cities Association
6. Gordon McHenry, Jr, Solid Ground

7. Jeff Natter, Pacific Hospital PDA
8. John Page, Village of Hope founder
9. Michael Brown, Seattle Foundation
10. Michael Woo, Got Green founder, volunteer
11. *Paola Maranan, The Children's Alliance*
12. Patty Hayes, Public Health-Seattle & King County
13. Scarlett Aldebot-Green, Metropolitan King County Council
14. Sili Savusa, White Center CDA
15. Tony To, HomeSight
16. Ubax Gardheere, Puget Sound Sage

COO Staff:

Alice Ito, Seattle Foundation, Seattle Foundation

Kirsten Wysen, Public Health-Seattle & King County

Cheryl Markham, King County Department of Community and Human Services

Aaron Robertson, Seattle Foundation

Nadine Chan, Evaluation, Public Health-Seattle & King County

AJ McClure, Public Health-Seattle & King County

Sharon Bogan, Communications, Public Health-Seattle & King County

Bao-Tram Do, Seattle Foundation

Holly Rohr Tran, Public Health-Seattle & King County